DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 103 179 RC 008 409

AUTHOR Photiadis, John; Maurer, B. B.
TITLE Religion in an Appalachian State. West Virginia University, Appalachian Center Research Report 6.
INSTITUTION West Virginia Univ., Morgantown. Appalachian Center.
REPORT NO WV-S-74-8-4
PUB DATE Feb 74
NOTE 29p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Age; Attitudes; Church Role; Community Size; Correlation; Health; Hypothesis Testing; Migration; *Need Gratification; Relationship; *Religion; Religious Factors; *Rural Population; *Social Adjustment; *Socioeconomic Status; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS Appalachia; *West Virginia

ABSTRACT

The proposition that Appalachian religion persists because it is performing a significant function as a mechanism helping the adjustment of people who due to modern changes, have become dislocated socially, economically, and psychologically was tested. Religiosity was defined on the basis of 4 variables: (1) religious beliefs; (2) need to use religion as a buffer to the outside world; (3) preference of religion as a way of life; and (4) church participation. Also tested were 3 sets of hypotheses dealing with: (1) the 4 religiosity aspects and socioeconomic and sociopsychological dimensions; (2) the sectarian, non-sectarian dichotomy; and (3) religiosity and community size and migration to the city. Approximately 1,100 male household heads from Mineral, Hardy, and Raleigh counties in West Virginia were interviewed. Clusters from the counties were selected on the basis of community size; region of state (mining, non-mining, northern and southern part of the state); and socioeconomic status. The hypothesis that the dispossessed, deprived, and alienated resulting from the upheaval of social and technological change in Appalachia would be those exhibiting the greatest need for the support of religion, was substantiated by the data. The aged, poor, less educated, alienated and infirm, all ranked significantly higher in religiosity than did the socially well-adjusted. (NQ)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RELIGION IN AN APPALACHIAN STATE

RECEIVED
APR 10 1975

by john photiadis
and
b. b. maurer

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

APPALACHIAN CENTER
Research Report 6
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

ED103179

I INTRODUCTION

If one were to consider one significant part of Appalachian culture which appears to be more typically Appalachian than other parts, undoubtedly it would be Appalachian religion. One possible reason for this is characteristics of early religion can be found in rural hollows which have been spared the invasion of modern technology more than other communities. However, even isolation does not seem to justify the persistence of Appalachian religion because other parts of Appalachian culture, including well-known aspects of Appalachian folklore, are fading away in front of the effects of modern technology.

Hard-surfaced roads, automobiles, and highly effective mass media bring people from isolated corners of the country both in contact and in communication with each other. The latter are two of the most powerful processes which help the creation of new systems of social relationships and the weakening of old ones; typical is the case of the rural community which is becoming more and more part of the larger society by responding socially and becoming absorbed by its broad cultural matrix. Thus peculiarities of the Appalachian culture change in shape and form to suit the prototype mass society is constantly projecting. But this is not the case with Appalachian religion, which not only does not fade away to fit the new materialism and rationality, but, as some claim, is growing stronger and more independent of the main stream of American culture and society.[1] This deviancy does not refer to the entire society, because the high emotional appeal of Appalachian religion, in spite of its regional peculiarities, tends to be very much in line with the needs of other dislocated segments of our society.[2] What we hypothesize and in turn attempt to test in this paper then, is the proposition that Appalachian religion persists because it is performing a significant function as a mechanism helping the adjustment of people who due to modern changes, have become dislocated socially–including economically, and psychologically. Do we then propose that this function of Appalachian religion is new? Probably not, at least not completely. Its role as a mechanism alleviating anxieties produced by the unknown, and physical discomfort, is probably reduced, but its role as a mechanism alleviating anxieties produced by modern societal dislocations has increased.

Study of modern Appalachian societal dislocations and their consequences has been the major objective of a larger study the present project is part of.[3] The overall proposition tested in that study is that Appalachia, the rural Appalachian social system in particular, due to the impact of the new mass society is losing its semi-autonomy and becoming a closer part of the larger society. Certain segments of Appalachian society, such as rural and low income people possessing fewer means, are facing more problems and frustrations during this process of integration into the larger society. Appalachian religion, it is proposed here, often constitutes a suitable mechanism helping dislocated people alleviate anxieties, and thus it is aiding adjustment to the new society. The testing of the propositions undertaken here is strictly empirical in form and sociological in nature and does not exclude testing on grounds more suitable to a theologian.

Finally, we should mention that although the social setting we deal with here constitutes a new testing ground, the area of theory we deal with has been treated under various forms by classical sociologists. Durkheim recognized the supportive role of religion for the believer. It gave the believer "impressions of comfort and dependence."[4] The believer who has communicated with his God. . .is a man who is stronger, he feels within him more force, either to endure the trials of existence, or to conquer them.[5] On the other hand, the proposition we advanced above is not in line with Max Weber's thesis presented in his "Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism" and his studies of the

division of personal and family development
appalachian center, west virginia university

RC 008409
0002

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

world's primitive religions suggesting that religion is an independent causal element influencing action throughout human history. Our case study is an illustration of the supportive and integrative role of religion, and furthermore, is an illustration of the close link between religion and society.[6] With this background in mind let us look at some of the more specific aspects of religion in Appalachia.

The religious picture is at best incomplete, the last reliable census being that of 1926.[7] The most recent ecumenical compilation of church membership in Appalachia by the Commission on Religion in Appalachia[8] is based upon official church statistics and thereby understates the actual situation by excluding Pentacostal, Holiness, and other sectarian groups for which data are not available. These sectarian groups constitute an important segment of the total religious population in Appalachia.

Brewer's report[9] of the religious picture in seven southern Appalachian states (including most of West Virginia) in 1958-9 indicates a proliferation of "small, struggling, subsidized and substandard churches" in multiple arrangements served by a predominantly bivocational clergy with limited professional training.

Adding to the difficulty of understanding the functions of various types of churches has been the differential rate of social change that has gripped the region, the heavy flow of out-migration, and an intra-regional diversity ranging from Pittsburgh and Knoxville on the one hand to Polecat Hollow and Outcrop on the other.[10]

The functional-dsyfunctional controversy over the role of the various types of churches and religion, in general, can, as we mentioned previously, be viewed best from the perspective of religion's ability to meet the needs of man. Unquestionably, religion in Appalachia substantially reflects the innerlife of the mountain people[11] and these data suggest that religion exhibits a historic vitality in adjusting and meeting the varied needs and conditions of Appalachians under the stress of social turmoil.

II METHODOLOGY

The important dimension in this paper is religiosity, which is treated only empirically and defined on the basis of four variables: (1) religious beliefs; (2) need to use religion as a buffer to the outside world; (3) preference of religion as a way of life; and (4) church participation. In part the analysis is also carried out in terms of the sectarian, non-sectarian dichotomy.

Religious beliefs are measured with four different questions, three of which measure standard or orthodox beliefs (see Table 22) while the fourth, *I believe the world is soon coming to an end*, implies belief which could be characterized as sectarian. The presence of this last question makes the belief scale different from a standard orthodox scale, but on the basis of the operational definition of belief used here, it is more suitable for studying beliefs in an Appalachian state. The implication of the presence of this item, then, should be that sectarian believers will appear stronger in their beliefs, especially when compared with members of institutionalized churches.

The variable, *need to use religion as a buffer to the outside world*, is measured with six questions designed to measure both the individual's attitudes and his personal feelings concerning the use of religion to cope with frustrations produced by pressures of modern everyday life. A sample of questions used in this scale is presented in Table 22. As with the belief scale, one of the questions used. . .*Churches should make provisions to help people testify they are saved*–implies sectarianism.

The variable, *reference of religion as a way of life*, is actually one of the nine different ways of life preferences used in this study which are not values per se, but close correlates of them. They have been chosen because they are mentioned in the literature as related to the Appalachian value orientation. Respondents were asked to rank the nine "preferences as to ways of life" and the resulting score was used to measure the extent of their preference for the particular way of life.[12]

Church participation, or church involvement, as it might also be described, is measured with a scale which combines church membership, frequency of participation, committee membership, and offices held. *Frequency of participation* is also treated as an independent dimension and refers to frequency of participation in church services. The remaining variables used in the study are defined in the section of the paper where they are treated.

Three sets of hypotheses are tested: the first deals with the relationship of the four religiosity aspects with socio-economic and socio-psychological dimensions whose testing could shed light on the function of religion in a changing Appalachia. The second set of hypotheses has a similar purpose, but instead of the four aspects of religiosity, the sectarian, non-sectarian dichotomy is used. Finally, the third set of hypotheses involves data presented elsewhere and deals with the relationship of religiosity, and (a) community size; and (b) migration to the city.

The sample, which is described in detail in another publication,[13] includes approximately eleven hundred male adult heads of households, and is a cluster random sample of a universe which includes the entire state of West Virginia. Clusters were selected on the basis of: (a) size of community; (b) region of state (mining, non-mining, northern and southern part of the state); and (c) socio-economic status. Thus, two counties, Mineral and Hardy, were selected from the northern part of the state and one county, Raleigh, from the southern part of the state. In each county, communities were selected on the basis of size. Inside these communities and for smaller communities in particular, the nth household was interviewed. For larger communities a stratified cluster sample based on socio-economic status was drawn. Thus, the town of Keyser, Mineral County, was divided into nine segments representing five different socio-economic strata. For each socio-economic stratum one segment was retained, and the nth household in this segment was marked for interview. In addition to these three counties, a similar but more elaborate procedure was followed to interview respondents in the cities of Charleston and Morgantown.[14]

000.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. METHODOLOGY	2
III. FINDINGS	4
A. Correlates of Selected Aspects of Religiosity	4
1. Age and Family Size	4
2. Socio-economic Status	4
3. Achievement and Success Orientation	6
4. Alienation	8
5. Change in Type of Church Affiliation	9
6. Differences Among Selected Denominations	9
7. Perception of Health	10
8. Satisfaction with Life	11
9. Church Involvement	11
10. Attitudes Toward Education, Progress and Welfare	12
11. Preferences as to Ways of Life	13
B. Correlates of Sectarianism	13
12. Religiosity	14
13. Socio-economic Status	14
14. Achievement Orientation	14
15. Alienation	15
16. Attitudes Towards Progress, Education and Welfare	17
17. Preferences as to Ways of Life	17
18. Perception of Health	17
C. Religiosity in Relationship to Community Size and Migration	17
19. Community Size	17
20. Migration	20
IV. CONCLUSIONS	24
Footnotes	26

0004

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III FINDINGS

A. Correlates of Selected Religiosity Aspects

1. *Age and Family Size*

Age: It is usually believed that people turn to religion as they grow older. Table 1 examines *age* in relation to the four different aspects of religiosity we are treating and, with the exception of the variable *preference of life in line with religion*, it shows that older people are more religious. But when it comes to preferring a life in line with religion as compared to, say family life or a life with many material conveniences, the two groups, those over fifty and those under fifty, are not different. Otherwise, older people tend to be stronger believers, have stronger need to use religion to alleviate anxieties produced by modern everyday living, but more than these two, are stronger church participants. Although all three x^2, which are used to test the relationship between age and these three aspects of religiosity, are significant at the one percent level, the actual association between *age* and *church participation*–measured with a coefficient of contingency (C)–[15] is considerably higher than the association with the other two aspects of religiosity, that of *belief* and of the *need to use religion as a buffer*. The coefficient of contingency (C) is .083, .105, and .609 correspondingly for the relationship between *age* and *need to use religion as a buffer*, *religious beliefs* and *church participation*.

Table 1
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGE AND ASPECTS OF RELIGIOSITY (N=1014-1044)

Age	% Strong Believers	% with Strong Need to use Relig. as a Buffer	% with Strong Preference for Religious Life	% with High Church Participation
50 or more	43.0%	60.0%	50.0%	66.0%
49 or less	33.0	51.0	46.0	46.0
	$x^2 = 12.0$*	$x^2 = 7.3$*	$x^2 = 1.4$	$x^2 = 40.3$*

*Significant at the one percent level.

The notion that older people are overriden with anxiety in trying to cope with everyday life and therefore turn to religion is not as much supported here as the notion that older people use religion and the church to both do something meaningful and feel less lonely. One reason for the probably less than expected score in the scale *need to alleviate anxieties through religion*, might be that most older people, particularly those who are retired, are not so much under pressure to achieve as they are lonely.

Family Size: Family size of the respondent is another characteristic which is associated in a particular way with four aspects of religiosity. As shown in Table 2, respondent heads of families of three or four members– a size approaching the typical American family–are involved in religion, and in particular in terms of *belief* and of *use of religion as a buffer*, less than respondents who are heads of either smaller or larger families.

This difference between respondents with more or less typical families and either larger or smaller families, exists in relation to all four aspects of religiosity, but is statistically significant only when respondents from small and medium size families are compared in terms of *belief* and *use of religion as a buffer*. There are about 42 percent strong believers among heads of families with one or two members and only about 33 percent among respondents with three and four children; the same is true, and with a wider difference, when the comparison refers to the variable, *need to use religion as a buffer* to alleviate anxieties produced by modern everyday life.

The above pattern of differences–those which are significant and those which are not–can be explained in terms of the use of religion as a mechanism to alleviate anxieties produced by modern complexity and change. Single individuals, some probably divorced or widowed, and couples without children might have more problems adjusting socially and psychologically to society, than, say, the father of a family with one or two children.

The same might be true for larger families, that is families with five or more members, which among other possible reasons, and other things being equal, will tend to be of lower income than, say, the family which includes only parents and one or two children. Lower income or socio-economic status, on the other hand, as shown in the following table, is closely and negatively associated with anxiety which in such cases is often produced by inability to keep up with modern society.

2. *Socio-economic Status (SES):* A widely examined correlate of modern alienation is socio-economic status. Due to increased expectations for higher income, level of living and often education, persons of lower socio-economic strata are, more than before, under pressure to perform according to these societal expectations. A semi-skilled worker, for instance, is not content anymore to retain the relative level of living which his occupation status provides;

0005

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FAMILY SIZE AND ASPECTS OF RELIGIOSITY (N=1018-1021)

Number of Members in the Family	% Strong Believers	% with Strong Need to use Relig. as a Buffer	% with Strong Preference for Religious Life	% with High Church Participation
1 - 2	42.0%	63.0%	56.0%	49.0%
	$x^2 = 5.1^*$	$x^2 = 13.8^{**}$	$x^2 = 1.0$	$x^2 = 0.9$
3 - 4	33.0	49.0	52.0	46.0
	$x^2 = 2.4$	$x^2 = 2.3$	$x^2 = 2.7$	$x^2 = 2.7$
5 or more	39.0	55.0	58.0	52.0

* Sig. at the five pct. level
** Sig. at the one pct. level

and furthermore, he has even higher expectations for his son. Now, if one considers the more limited availability of means in rural areas such as those of Appalachia and to lower strata in general, as compared to higher ones, one could easily see some of the causes for the often discussed alienation, and in turn anxiety, of the lower strata of our society.[16]

This dislocation of lower socio-economic strata which rapid changes produce, constitutes only one such aspect of societal dislocation. The consequences of some of these dislocations are one of our major concerns in this paper. As previously indicated, one of our main interests is the testing of hypotheses involving the relationship between socio-economic dislocation(s) and religiosity. More specifically, we expect higher religiosity among dislocated groups, in particular among those lacking some means for coping with them. We assume testing of these hypotheses will offer us indications as to the contemporary role religion is playing in Appalachia and probably elsewhere. However, even if our entire set of hypotheses is supported, we could not assume that religion exists simply because there is tension and helps to reestablish equilibrium in society by reducing tension, because we all know there are many people who are not under the tensions described above and are very religious.[17] Data in Table 3 shows that, excluding church participation, religiosity is related negatively to socio-economic status.

Table 3
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND ASPECTS OF RELIGIOSITY (N=985-1065)

Status Aspect	Intensity	% Strong Believers	% with Strong Need to use Relig. as a Buffer	% with Strong Preference for Religious Life	% with High Church Participation
S.E.S.	High	25.0%	21.0%	50.0%	59.0%
	Low	54.0	61.0	62.0	41.0
		$x^2 = 89.6^*$	$x^2 = 84.9^*$	$x^2 = 13.0^*$	$x^2 = 31.2^*$
Income	High	25.0	39.0	47.0	59.0
	Low	55.0	56.0	59.0	43.0
		$x^2 = 62.3^*$	$x^2 = 68.9^*$	$x^2 = 13.4^*$	$x^2 = 21.7^*$
Level of Living	High	29.0	47.0	52.0	55.0
	Low	48.0	66.0	60.0	37.0
		$x^2 = 37.6^*$	$x^2 = 38.4^*$	$x^2 = 7.1^*$	$x^2 = 33.5^*$
Education	High	34.0	35.0	63.0	58.0
	Low	57.0	64.0	72.0	41.0
		$x^2 = 52.1^*$	$x^2 = 82.1^*$	$x^2 = 9.2^*$	$x^2 = 25.1^*$

*Sig. at the one pct. level

0006

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Socio-economic status is measured with the combined score of three separate dimensions: respondent's income, his formal education, and the status of his occupation.[18] The first row of Table 3 shows the strong negative correlation between socio-economic status and three of the four aspects of religiosity: *belief*, *need to alleviate through religion anxieties produced by everyday life*, and *preference of religion as a way of life*. The coefficient of contingency is much higher between the first two compared to the third variable, indicating the higher association of these two variables with *SES*. Church participation correlates positively with *SES*.

Because we do not have information suggesting that such a negative relationship has been found elsewhere, it could be a peculiarity of Appalachia.[19] In particular, it could be due to the fact that some lower *SES* respondents, although strong believers, not only do not attend, but do not even belong to a church. Otherwise, studies conducted elsewhere have shown that a considerably greater number of higher *SES* respondents are high church participants without being strong believers, and sometimes even without being believers.[20]

The strong believer, therefore, who is not a church member or a frequent participant, could (due to the frequency of his occurance as compared to other regions) be more or less an Appalachian attribute. In that case one might ask himself how this person strengthens (through conditioning) his beliefs without the church, its ritual, and symbols. Considering that such people are often found in rural and isolated areas, one might speculate that they condition their beliefs through their own daily activity in the way old hermits did. Furthermore, it could be that the anxiety modern everyday life produces in these lower *SES* individuals could itself constitute a conditioning factor by becoming instrumental through the need it creates for Bible reading or contemplation of God.[21]

We should indicate at this point that the form of church participation we have used in Table 3 is a modified Chapin formal participation scale taking into account offices and committee memberships held. Therefore, upper *SES* respondents might hold a larger number offices and thus be shown to be high participants without being frequent attendants. Further testing, however, indicates that frequency of participation is also related positively to *SES*.

One could also speculate that certain lower *SES* believers do not participate simply because the institutionalized church their parents belonged to and feel they should also belong, does not satisfy their needs for anxiety alleviation which the new society produced. In support, although not proof, of this speculation is the fact that the coefficient of contingency, indicating the extent of association between *SES* and *belief*, is much higher when it comes to the variable *belief*, and the variable *need to use religion as a buffer to the outside world* compared to the relationship with the variable *preference of religion as a way of life* which involves more rewards of a social nature as compared to rewards dealing with direct alleviation of one's anxieties. The latter is the case with the function of *belief* and *need to use religion as a buffer*, and it might be that this is the reason these two are associated with lower *SES*.

Similar types of relationships exist with each of the three individual components of *SES* as shown in the second line of Table 3, income,[22] which is one of the components of the *SES* scale, is related to the four aspects of religiosity in exactly the same way as *SES*. Similar relationships exist with *level of living*, which is the dimension involving possession of home items, means of transportation and use of communication media.[23] *Formal education*, another component of *SES*, shows a relationship with *religiosity* similar to that of the other variables of Table 3. *Church participation*, again in contrast to the other three aspects of *religiosity* is related positively to *education*.[24] As it has been the case with other forms of *socio-economic status*, the association is highest with the variable *need to use religion as a buffer* and *belief*, followed by *preference of religion as a way of life*, and by a reverse relationship with *church participation*: correspondingly the coefficients of contingency in these relationships are: -.279, -.226, -.097, and +.165.

The relationship of *religiosity* and the third component of the *SES* scale, *occupational status*, is shown in Table 4. Again with the exception of *church participation*, this table shows that the higher the *occupational status* of the respondent the less his *religiosity*. This is more the case with *religiosity* involving beliefs and more so with the variable *need to use religion as a buffer to the outside world*; these two aspects of *religiosity* when examined for their association with *occupational status*, show a considerably higher coefficient of contingency than the association with the variable *preference of life in line with religion*, which does not involve the emotionalism of the two other aspects of *religiosity*. Excluding farmers, *church participation* remains as before related positively to *occupational status*.

We should mention here that the type of church many farmers in our sample belong to, for instance, the Church of the Brethren, might be responsible for their high participation. Farmers, the unskilled and the semi-skilled are among the few groups treated in this paper which show some kind of consistency among all four aspects of religiosity. An extreme case is the professionals who have very low scores in *belief* and very high ones in *participation*.

Working full-time versus *working part-time* or *being unemployed* (shown in Appendix Table 1) is another socio-economic dimension highly differentiating respondents in terms of *religiosity*. But again this differentiation is similar to that of other measurements of *socio-economic status*.

3. *Achievement and Success Orientation:* If one wanted to hypothesize the direction of the relationship between *religiosity* and *achievement orientation*, he could go in two different directions: first, he might consider that a person who is achievement oriented should be under stress and tension and therefore might need religion to

0007

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TYPE OF OCCUPATION AND ASPECTS OF RELIGIOSITY (N=788-800)*

Type of Occupation	% Strong Believers	% with Strong Need to use Relig. as a Buffer	% with Strong Preference for Religious Life	% with High Church Participation
Unskilled and Semi-skilled	45.0%	62.0%	59.0%	45.0%
Farmer	45.0	65.0	58.0	87.0
Skilled	33.0	38.0	54.0	45.0
White Collar, Managerial & Businessman	28.0	38.0	53.0	55.0
Professional	21.0	39.0	43.0	67.0

*Occupations not fitting the categories have been excluded

Table 5
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACHIEVEMENT AND SUCCESS ORIENTATION AND ASPECTS OF RELIGIOSITY, HOLDING SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS CONSTANT (N=1007-1045)

Achievement and Success Orientation	% Strong Believers		% with Strong Need to use Relig. as a Buffer		% with Strong Preference for Religious Life		% with High Church Participation	
High	24.0%		38.0%		40.0%		53.0%	
Low	46.0		63.0		62.0		51.0	
	$x^2 = 43.43^*$		$x^2 = 64.99^*$		$x^2 = 49.06^*$		$x^2 = 0.00$	
	S.E.S.		S.E.S.		S.E.S.		S.E.S.	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
High	51.0	72.0	25.0	49.0	43.0	55.0	54.0	53.0
Low	68.0	80.0	36.0	63.0	65.0	69.0	56.0	49.0
	$x^2 = 15.8^*$	$x^5 = 8.1^*$	$x^2 = 7.5^*$	$x^2 = 0.1$	$x^2 = 24.6^*$	$x^2 = 8.4^*$	$x^2 = 0.1$	$x^2 = 0.6$

*Sig. at the one pct. level

alleviate his anxieties, in that case, we should expect a positive relationship between *achievement orientation* and *religiosity*. Second, he might consider that a person who is religious, and in particular if he believes, as is the case in certain churches in Appalachia, that real success can be found only in heaven, he should not be interested in *achievement* the way it is prescribed by secular society. In the latter case one should, in addition, examine to see whether the negative relationship between *religiosity* and *achievement* was not due to *religiosity* as such, but to *SES*, which as we have shown previously, is related negatively to *religiosity*. Table 5, again, with the exception of *church participation*, indicates that *religiosity* is related negatively to *achievement and success orientation*.

Achievement and success orientation is measured on the basis of: first, the ranking of the nine preferences as to ways of life which we have already mentioned; and second, the priority given by the respondent to his choice. Respondents who value higher styles of life related to *achievement and success orientation* received higher scores as compared to styles of life which are not related to achievement and success; for instance, a person who checked as first choice life in line with achievement, the first rank value, which is in turn multiplied by three, the score given for using this value as first choice.[25] If he checked education—which is the second in rank value—as his first choice, he would have received for that value a score of 24; eight multiplied by three. Judges were used to rank the various preferences as to ways of life as to their importance as aspects of *achievement orientation*.

0606

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As shown in Table 5, with the exception of *church participation*, which is not related to *achievement and success orientation*, all three other aspects of *religiosity* are negatively related to this composite index, and the relationship is significant at the one percent level. When socio-economic status is controlled, the three negative relationships, although reduced, especially under low *SES*, remain, in particular under high *SES*, significant at the one percent level.

The degree of association between these three variables and *achievement and success* measured with a coefficient of contingency, is shown to be considerably reduced. In other words, it appears that only part of the lower *achievement and success orientation* of those who are religious is probably related to their religion. Because, at least as the figures show, the rest of this motivation is due to some attribute or correlate of socio-economic status.

4. *Alienation:* A supportive proposition we have been advancing throughout this paper is that various segments of today's society, such as older people, lower *SES* groups, etc., become economically, socially and psychologically dislocated due to consequences of rapid technological changes and therefore need religion to alleviate their anxieties. An intermediate psychological stage between dislocation and need for religion is the feeling of alienation which dislocations produce. Alienation, therefore, should be hypothesized as being associated with religiosity.

Alienation from society is measured here in terms of two aspects which we have considered appropriate for the conditions which prevail in Appalachia; the first deals with mistrust of government officials, the other with feelings of bewilderment and confusion.[26]

Mistrust of government officials is measured with four questions referring to the individual's faith in his public officers.[27] The upper part of Table 6 shows the high positive correlation between *mistrust of government officials* and *belief* and *need to use religion as a buffer*.

Consistent with the testing of previous hypotheses, the variable *preference of life in line with religion*, although also positive and significant at the one percent level, as might be expected, shows lower association—measured with contingency coefficient—than the other two forms of religiosity. The relationship to *church participation* is opposite to the other three forms of *religiosity*, being negatively related to mistrust.

Because of the possibility that this form of alienation might not be produced by religion, but simply by malfunctioning of the socio-economic structure, and in particular *SES*, which is related to religion negatively, *SES* is used as a control variable.

As the lower part of Table 6 shows, the positive relationship between *mistrust* and *preference of life in line with religion*, and the negative relationship with *church participation* have both disappeared. The relationship between *mistrust* and both the variables *belief* and *need to use religion as a buffer* as shown through a contingency coefficient, although still significant at the one percent level, has been considerably reduced. This is more the case under the low *SES* group.

The changes, then, which appear when *SES* is controlled, suggest that the initial relationship with the variables *church participation* and *preference of religion as a way of life* seem to be due to the underlying relationship with *SES*. The variables *belief* and *need to use religion as a buffer* are only partly influenced by *SES*. In other words, the initial relationship between the two more emotional aspects of *religiosity* seems to be related to *mistrust* both because of the presence of these beliefs and feelings, and

Table 6
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MISTRUST IN GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND ASPECTS OF RELIGIOSITY, HOLDING SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS CONSTANT (N=1002-1032)

Mistrust of Government Officials	% Strong Believers		% with Strong Need to Use Relig. as a Buffer		% with Strong Preference for Religious Life		% with High Church Participation	
High	52.0%		68.0%		60.0%		44.0%	
Low	25.0		44.0		51.0		52.0	
	$x^2 = 82.8^{**}$		$x^2 = 75.8^{**}$		$x^2 = 8.7^{**}$		$x^2 = 5.6^{*}$	
	S.E.S.		S.E.S.		S.E.S.		S.E.S.	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
High	40.0	59.0	55.0	77.0	55.0	63.0	54.0	44.0
Low	18.0	44.0	38.0	61.0	49.0	58.0	56.0	48.0
	$x^2 = 28.9^{**}$	$x^2 = 8.8^{**}$	$x^2 = 14.9^{**}$	$x^2 = 12.5^{**}$	$x^2 = 1.6$	$x^2 = 2.7$	$x^2 = 0.1$	$x^2 = 1.8$

*Sig. at the five pct. level
**Sig. at the one pct. level

0005

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

also because of the malfunction of the socio-economic structure, which at least today produces more problems for those of lower *SES*.

Table 7, similar to Table 6, deals with the relationship between *religiosity* and the second aspects of alienation measured here; feelings of *bewilderment and confusion*, while again, holding *SES* constant.

Table 7
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BEWILDERMENT AND CONFUSION AND ASPECTS OF RELIGIOSITY HOLDING SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS CONSTANT
(N=1002-1029)

Bewilderment and Confusion	% Strong Believers		% with Strong Need to Use Relig. as a Buffer		% with Strong Preference for Religious Life		% with High Church Participation	
High	47.0%		71.0%		60.0%		46.0%	
Low	27.0		36.0		50.0		53.0	
	$x^2 = 47.7^*$		$x^2 = 129.7^*$		$x^2 = 9.1^*$		$x^2 = 3.8$	
	S.E.S.		S.E.S.		S.E.S.		S.E.S.	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
High	68.0	79.0	65.0	77.0	66.0	72.0	52.0	46.0
Low	47.0	69.0	29.0	55.0	57.0	71.0	57.0	46.0
	$x^2 = 20.8^*$	$x^2 = 1.6$	$x^2 = 70.8^*$	$x^2 = 18.5^*$	$x^2 = 2.4$	$x^2 = 0.1$	$x^2 = 0.9$	$x^2 = 0.01$

*Sig. at the one pct. level

Bewilderment and confusion is measured with six questions designed to measure one's bewilderment and confusion as to how he reacts to the way society is functioning today.[28] Table 7 shows that this aspect of alienation is related to the four different aspects of *religiosity* in a manner relatively similar to that of the variable *mistrust*. The only differences from the findings of Table 6 are: first, *church participation*, although negative, as expected, is not significantly related to *bewilderment and confusion;* and second, probably as one might expect, even when *SES* is controlled, *need to use religion as a buffer to the outside world* shows very high initial association (upper part of Table 7) with the variable *bewilderment and confusion*, which although reduced, remains high when *SES* is controlled. This then suggests that, as it was the case with *mistrust in government officials*, this aspect of alienation also remains related to *religiosity* regardless of the variable *socio-economic status*. In other words, we could say, people who feel bewildered and confused tend to be religious regardless if they are upper, middle, or lower socio-economic status. But we also know that low *SES* people feel more bewildered and confused than middle or upper *SES*.[29] Let us turn now to some of the consequences alienation produces.

5. *Change in Type of Church Affliation:* Recent studies describe sectarianism as at least holding its own, if not expanding.[30] This situation exists in spite of the fact that *level of living* and *formal education*, two factors known to be negatively related to sectarian growth, are on considerable increase in Appalachia today. The theoretical framework which we have used to propose our hypotheses suggests that modern socio-psychological dislocations–of rural and lower *SES* Appalachians in particular–producing alienation and the anxiety associated with it, lead many believers into either joining or remaining within the sectarian realm.

Table 8 shows the relationship between *change in type of church* and *religiosity* which supports our previous hypotheses, because, this table shows there are more believers among those who change from non-sectarian to sectarian, or change, but remain sectarian (about 49.0 percent), compared to those who become from sectarian, either non-sectarian or change but remain non-sectarian (about 25.0 percent). Further support because people now live under more stress, is offered by data in this same table (Table 8) showing that the difference between the two groups we are comparing is more pronounced–as differences in coefficients of contingency indicate–when it comes to comparison with the variable which measures *need to use religion as a buffer* to alleviate anxieties produced by modern society; the corresponding percentages are 62.0 for those who change to sectarian and 29.0 percent for those who change to non-sectarian. Differences in relation to *preferences to life in line with religion*, which is a dimension with less emotional appeal than *need to use religion as a buffer* are smaller, but still significant at the five percent level. Furthermore, as one might expect from previous information, the variable *church participation* does not differentiate from the two groups.

6. *Differences Among Denominations:* Further support of the speculations we have been testing comes

0010

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 8
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHANGE FROM NON-SECTARIAN TO SECTARIAN (AND VICE VERSA) AND ASPECTS OF RELIGIOSITY (N=115)

Type of Change	% Strong Believers	% with Strong Need to use Relig. as a Buffer	% with Strong Preference for Religious Life	% with High Church Participation
Changed to Sectarian or, changed but remained Sectarian	49.0%	62.0%	68.0%	68.0%
Changed to non-sectarian or, changed but	23.0	29.0	49.0	62.0
	$x^2 = 7.1^{**}$	$x^2 = 10.7^{**}$	$x^2 = 3.3^{*}$	$x^2 = 0.4$

*Approaches five pct. level of sig.
**Sig. at the one pct. level

from Table 9 where *religiosity* is examined among selected denominations. Roman Catholics, who are members of a church with highly institutionalized and formalized rituals, have the lowest proportion of respondents who score high in the two emotional aspects of *religiosity; belief* and *need to use religion as a buffer*. As indicated in the methodology section of this paper, the belief scale we use here refers to Appalachian beliefs and includes a question implying both sectarianism and behavior not in direct line with Roman Catholic teaching. The opposite is true for members of the Evangelical United Brethren Church which is an informal church with a particular type of sectarian emotionality.[31] Furthermore, the differences between the two groups, as measured with a measurement of association, are again more pronounced when it comes to *use of religion as a buffer*. As might be expected, in relation to the two emotional aspects of religiosity, respondents of Methodist affiliation fall somewhere in the middle, and in terms of association, as measured with a contingency coefficient, are closer to the Roman Catholic group.

Furthermore, and again as it was the case with the testing of the previous hypotheses, the differences in terms of *reference of religion as a way of life* are smaller and refer to the differences between the two institutionalized churches and the Evangelical United Brethren. Finally as might be expected, participation is highest among the Roman Catholic respondents.

Information on religiosity of additional denominations is given in Appendix Table 2. The reader should be reminded at this point that the sample we used here has not been drawn with denominational representation in mind, and therefore percentages shown in that table should be considered with caution.

7. *Perception of Health:* If one were to look for further major sources of stress, besides those of a socio-economic nature, and then examine them for possible association to religiosity, he should probably look at a person's physical health. What we are examining here in relation to *religiosity* (Table 10) is only *perception of one's health*. The negative relationship only approaches the five percent level when it comes to *preference of religion as a way of life* and furthermore, is reversed when it comes to *church participation*.

Table 9
DIFFERENCES IN RELIGIOSITY AMONG MEMBERS OF THREE DIFFERENT DENOMINATIONS

Denomination	% Strong Believers	% with Strong Need to use Relig. as a Buffer	% with Strong Preference for Religious Life	% with High Church Participation
Catholic	21.0%	19.0%	49.0%	73.0%
	$x^2 = 0.8$	$x^2 = 8.6^{*}$	$x^2 = 0.01$	$x^2 = 10.3^{**}$
Methodist	27.0	38.0	47.0	53.0
	$x^2 = 12.3^{*}$	$x^2 = 29.0^{*}$	$x^2 = 14.8^{**}$	$x^2 = 0.8$
Evangelical United Brethren	46.0	68.0	69.0	58.0

*Sig. at the one pct. level

0011

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 10
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEPTION OF ONE'S HEALTH AND ASPECTS OF RELIGIOSITY (N=1033-1065)

Perception of Good Health	% Strong Believers	% with Strong Need to Use Relig. as a Buffer	% with Strong Preference for Religious Life	% with High Church Participation
High	23.0%	26.0%	30.0%	39.0%
Medium	32.0	33.0	35.0	36.0
Low	45.0	41.0	35.0	25.0
	$x^2 = 38.02$*	$x^2 = 39.33$*	$x^2 = 3.07$	$x^2 = 40.51$*

*Sig. at the one pct. level

Because the relationship between *religiosity* and *perception of health* might be due to a negative relationship between *SES* and *perception of good health*, *SES* has been used as control variable of the relationships. All three significant relationships were retained at the one percent level. But the association—as measured with the coefficient of contingency—under both the high and low of the control variable of the relationship between *religiosity* and *perception of good health*, was lower for all three aspects of *religiosity*. This would in turn suggest that part of the emotional aspects of the religiosity of people who do not perceive themselves as healthy is probably due to the fact that they are also of lower *SES*. On the other hand, more people who perceive themselves as healthy go to church and this is not due to their *SES* but probably to their health itself, because the relationship between *church participation* and *perception of good health* is retained when *SES* is controlled.

8. *Satisfaction with Life:* We have shown in the previous pages that the old, the poor, the uneducated, those with less important jobs, and those who do not perceive themselves as being healthy, tend to be more religious than people who do not have these shortcomings. Let us see not how satisfied with their lives more religious people are. If we find these people are more satisfied with their lives than those who are not as religious, we will have some further support for the proposition we have been advancing throughout this paper concerning the anxiety alleviating role religion plays. Such a role is by no means new, but in many respects the setting and the circumstances are drastically different from those of the past; typical in this case are the feelings of relative deprivation, and in turn alienation, which have developed in recent years among rural and low income people and Appalachians in particular.[32] For these two groups, feelings of relative deprivation and alienation were not as important anxiety producing factors as other circumstances. For instance, inability to explain certain natural phenomena was probably more important.

Life satisfaction is measured here as satisfaction in terms of: (1) one's job; (2) his ability to do things he wants to do; (3) his family life; (4) the kind of life his community can offer; (5) the kind of life the Appalachian region can offer; (6) his overall economic position; and (7) life in general.[33]

Table 11 shows the relationship between the four aspects of *religiosity* and *life satisfaction*, indicating that *religiosity* is positively related to *satisfaction with life*. However, the relationship between two of the four aspects of *religiosity*—*belief* and *preference of a life in line with religion*—although positive, is not significant at the five percent level.

The positive relationship of satisfaction with the variable *need to use religion as a buffer* can be easily explained. But in order to explain the positive relationship with *participation* one should probably consider that, although high church participants are not always religious, they often have fewer shortcomings—for instance, low income and low education—than low church participants, and therefore they do not need strong emotional religion to be satisfied with their lives. At this point we will try to see how religious high church participants are, before we discuss consequences of religiosity which deal with attitudes towards education, progress and welfare.

9. *Church Involvement:* As explained in the methodology, although we sometimes use only frequency of participation as a dimension, throughout this paper we use participation as a composite index which includes frequency of participation, offices and committee positions held and membership in a church. Table 12, then, shows how *church participation*, the way we just defined it, is related to the three other aspects of *religiosity*, and it indicates that high church participants are stronger believers, feel stronger *need to use religion as a buffer to the outside world*, and value *a life in line with religion* more than those who are weaker participants. In other words, those who are more involved in the church, although having more pronounced attributes than those with high scores in other forms of *religiosity*, have for instance, *higher education* and *SES* (both attributes found to be negatively related to the other forms of religiosity) and tend to be stronger than weaker participants of the high *SES* group in all three aspects of religiosity examined here.

0012

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 11
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LIFE SATISFACTION AND ASPECTS OF RELIGIOSITY (N=1010-1041)

Aspect of Religiosity	Intensity	% with High Life Satisfaction	
Belief	High	51.0%	$x^2 = 2.2$
	Low	46.0	
Need to Use Religion as a Buffer	High	52.0	$x^2 = 8.7$*
	Low	42.0	
Preference for Religious Life	High	50.0	$x^2 = 3.1$
	Low	45.0	
Church Participation	High	54.0	$x^2 = 10.7$*
	Low	43.0	

*Sig. at the one pct. level

Table 12
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHURCH PARTICIPATION AND OTHER ASPECTS OF RELIGIOSITY (N=1013-1015)

Church Participation	% Strong Believers	% with Strong Need to use Relig. as a Buffer	% with Strong Preference for Religious Life
High	70.0%	55.0%	58.0%
Low	59.0	42.0	40.0
	$x^2 = 13.33$*	$x^2 = 15.59$*	$x^2 = 32.52$*

*Sig. at the five pct. level

10. *Attitudes Toward Education, Progress and Welfare:* Table 13 shows the relationship between *religiosity* and *attitudes toward education, progress and welfare,* which at least from the point of view of action programs, are crucial for the Appalachian. Each attitude is measured with a number of individual questions which are discussed in another publication.[34] The first impression of this table is that, in relation to these three attitudes our four aspects of *religiosity* do not behave in a uniform pattern, although patterns involving aspects of the table are quite obvious.

All aspects of *religiosity* are related negatively to *attitudes toward education;* but the relationship with the variable *need to use religion as a buffer,* which involves a more emotional aspect of *religiosity,* is not related to this attitude. *Attitudes toward progress* are not significantly related to any of the four aspects of *religiosity.* But *attitudes toward welfare* are closely related to the two more emotional aspects of *religiosity; belief* and *need to use religion as a buffer.* The relationship with *church participation,* however, is negative.

It is quite possible that the relationship between *religiosity* and *attitudes toward welfare* could be determined, not by *religiosity,* but by *socio-economic status,* which we know is related negatively to *religiosity* and to *attitudes toward welfare.* When *SES* is controlled, the initial negative relationship between *religiosity* and *favorable attitudes toward education* becomes positive. But although the significant positive relationship between *religiosity* and *attitudes toward welfare* in some cases disappears when *SES* is controlled, it remains positive and in the case of belief, still significant at the one percent level. In other words, if it were not for the interviewing role of the variable *SES, religiosity* would be related positively to *favorable attitudes*

0013

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 13
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ASPECTS OF RELIGIOSITY
AND SELECTED ATTITUDES (N=1007-1035)

Aspect of Religiosity	Intensity	Proportion of Respondents with Favorable Attitudes Toward: Education	Progress	Welfare
	High	39.0%	61.0%	58.0%
Belief				
	Low	51.0	60.0	42.0
		$x^2 = 12.9^{**}$	$x^2 = 0.1$	$x^2 = 25.9^{**}$
	High	42.0	50.0	61.0
Need to use Religion as a Buffer				
	Low	43.0	44.0	42.0
		$x^2 = 0.1$	$x^2 = 3.5$	$x^2 = 34.0^{**}$
	High	39.0	47.0	55.0
Preference for Religious Life				
	Low	46.0	49.0	50.0
		$x^2 = 5.0^{*}$	$x^2 = 0.3$	$x^2 = 2.8$
	High	38.0	47.0	47.0
Church Participation				
	Low	47.0	47.0	57.0
		$x^2 = 8.9^{**}$	$x^2 = 0.0$	$x^2 = 9.9^{**}$

*Sig. at the five pct. level
**Sig. at the one pct. level

toward education. But control of *SES* would not alter the positive relationship between *religiosity* and *favorable attitudes toward welfare.*[35]

11. *Preferences as to ways of life:* Appendix Table 3 shows the relationship between nine *preferences as to ways of life*–which we have mentioned in the methodology section–and *religiosity*. This table shows that *religiosity* is related: (1) positively to preference of a life in line with: (a) religion and (b) outdoor living[36] and (2) negatively to a life in line with: (a) education; (b) material conveniences; (c) recreation and (d) for some aspects of religiosity, to work and friendship.

B. **Correlates of Sectarianism**

Sectarianism, and the sect in particular, are often seen as. . .

> Lay Christianity, personal achievement in ethics and in religion, the radical fellowship of love, religious equality and brotherly love, indifference toward the authority of the state and the ruling class, dislike of technical law and of the oath, the separation of the religious life from the economic struggle by means of the ideal of poverty and frugality. . ., the directness of the personal religious relationship, criticism of official spiritual guides and theologians, the appeal to the New Testament and the primitive church.[37]

This concept of sect is broadened by some to apply to any religious protest against systems which tend to ignore personal needs by placing strong emphasis on social and ecclesiastical realignment; placing emphasis on the idea of protest against the failure of established churches to deal successfully with feelings of inadequacy, confusion, ennui, pain and guilt. In such a broad sense Milton Yinger defines a sect "as a movement in which the primary emphasis is the attempt to satisfy, by religious means, various individual needs."[38]

If we were to take a brief look at the church–as compared to the sect–we could say that it emphasizes sacrament and creed (and not proper behavior as the sect does), makes efforts to insure social coehsion and order, and in order to bring everyone within "its means of grace" shows willingness to compromise with various forms of societal structures. Sometimes, both social structures and churches themselves are unsuited to meeting human needs. To an extent, if not to a considerable extent, this has been true in Appalachia for a number of years now. The new needs, such as those produced by the feeling of relative deprivation and frustrations, are consequences of the recent incorporation of the region into the larger society and have not been successfully met by either formal church or government.[39] Needs such as these we have been discussing

0014

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 14
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ASPECTS OF RELIGIOSITY AND SECTARIAN AND NON-SECTARIAN AFFILIATION (N=886-914)*

Affiliation	% Strong Believers	% with Strong Need to use Relig. as a Buffer	% with Strong Preference for Religious Life	% with High Church Participation
Non-sectarian	30.0%	36.0%	53.0%	55.0%
Sectarian	57.0	72.0	70.0	55.0
	$x^2 = 51.4$**	$x^2 = 79.7$**	$x^2 = 18.7$**	$x^2 = 0.4$

*Not all denominations are included
**Sig. at the one pct. level

in this paper, we hypothesize, are closely related to the fact that sectarianism is holding its own in Appalachia, if not growing. More specifically, what we do in this part of this report is to use the theoretical framework found throughout this analysis to propose hypotheses dealing with differences in selected characteristics between members of sectarian and non-sectarian churches.

Sectarian churches include those which are usually known as such; the Church of God, Pentecostal, Holiness and Seventh Day Adventists. Churches which include branches which might belong to both sectarian and non-sectarian churches are placed in a different category.

As we have indicated above, one of the major functions of modern sectarian churches is to help people who have a strong need to alleviate anxieties modern society produces. A larger part of such anxieties, at least today, is produced by what are–for at least some people, such as the poor and uneducated–dysfunctional social structures. The success of the treatment these churches provide is based on strong beliefs.

12. *Religiosity:* Table 14 shows the difference in *religiosity* between members of *non-sectarian* and *sectarian churches. Sectarian* respondents tend to be considerably stronger believers, and have stronger need to alleviate, through religion, anxieties produced by modern complexity and change.

The *religiosity* variable, which deals with value of a life in line with religion, is also significantly related to *sectarianism* (at the one percent level), but the degree of this association, as measured with a contingency coefficient, is much weaker than the association with the other two *religiosity* aspects which are more emotional in nature. Finally, the association in terms of *participation*–the least emotional aspect of *religiosity*–is not shown to exist. As we mentioned previously, the latter is the case for at least two reasons: because a number of weak non-sectarian believers (many of high *SES*) are strong participants and, second, because a number of strong believers–some living in isolated rural communities–are not even members of a church.

13. *Socio-economic Status:* Table 15 supports the already well-documented proposition that one important reason for the anxiety of the sectarian and, in turn, his need to alleviate it, is a function of his position in the social hierarchy. There have always been certain segments of our society less privileged but, at least in the past, such segments did not feel as strongly relatively deprived in terms of expected life styles, and did not feel as bewildered and confused as they now do. As we mentioned previously, modern complexity, acceptance of an ideology which stresses equality, and a social structure which provides fewer means for certain segments are some of the reasons for such dislocations.

Table 15 shows that members of sectarian churches have lower levels of living than non-sectarians but still develop similar desires and, in turn, expectations for a higher level of living since they are exposed to the same media, (and in most cases the same messages) as those who can afford a higher level of living. Table 15 also shows the difference in *socio-economic status* between the participants of the two types of churches. The same differences exist when each component of the *SES* scale–*income, occupation* and *education*–is examined separately. The implication of lower education is in some respects different from that of income, which is primarily associated with economic achievement and level of living, one of the major motivations of society, because higher education, in addition to providing means for securing higher income, helps the individual perceive the existing order in society, thus to feel less alienated from it, and, in turn, less frustrated. The third column of Table 15 shows differences between the two types of religious groups in relation to involvement in formal organizations and through them into society itself. Such involvement could also lead to less alienation, and in turn, to less need to alleviate the anxieties it produced.

The variables *level of living* and *formal participation* are not components of the *SES* scale, so *SES* could be used as the control variable to test their relationship with *sectarianism.* When *SES* is controlled, the positive relationship between *formal participation* and *non-sectarian membership* disappears completely, while the one with *level of living* becomes reduced drastically, though still significant at the five percent level.[40]

0010

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 15
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS AND SECTARIAN AND NON-SECTARIAN AFFILIATION (N=873)*

Affiliation	% with High Level of Living	% with High Socio-economic Status	% with High Participation in Formal Organizations
Non-sectarian	67.0%	51.0%	57.0%
Sectarian	39.0	17.0	42.0
	$x^2 = 53.46$**	$x^2 = 76.09$**	$x^2 = 14.40$**

*Members who do not clearly fit the two categories have been eliminated
**Sig. at the one pct. level

Finally, Appendix Table 4 shows that higher status occupations have lower proportions of members of sectarian churches, with the probable exception of farmers, who despite having the higher proportions of sectarian respondents, have a status which should, at least in West Virginia, actually be placed between semi-skilled and skilled. In national samples, however, farmers are usually placed in the position they appear in Appendix Table 4.

14. *Achievement Orientation:* Concerning the *sectarian, non-sectarian* dichotomy *achievement orientation* could be examined in terms of two different directions. A person could have turned sectarian because he was achievement oriented, but for some reason—for instance, lack of means such as formal education—never made the score; so he joined a sectarian church to forget his problems. Or it could be that because this individual is involved in a sectarian church, he does not have any interest in worldly success. Table 16 deals with the relationship between *achievement orientation* and the *sectarian, non-sectarian* dichotomy indicating that *non-sectarians* are actually more interested in achieving.

The relationship of Table 16, however, which is significant at the one percent level, becomes non-significant when *SES* is used as a control variable.[41] In other words, the lower interest in achievement of the *sectarian* is not due to his religion, but most probably to some attribute of his lower socio-economic status.

Because of the importance of the relationship between *sectarianism* and *achievement*, particularly from the point of view of its implication for programs of directed change, *achievement* is also examined in terms of the dimension *achievement and success orientation* which we have defined and examined when discussing Table 5. Table 17 then shows the relationship between *achievement orientation* (which we have said is a composite index based on the ranking of nine preferences as to ways of life) and the *sectarian, non-sectarian* dichotomy. As was the case with Table 16, the relationship shows that sectarian people tend to less achievement oriented. But, again, when this initial relationship (lower part of Table 17) is tested with *SES* as a control variable, the relationship under the high of the control variable disappears while remaining significant at the five percent level under low *SES*. The coefficient of contingency of the relationship significant at the five percent level, is considerably lower than the one in the initial table (upper part of Table 17). This suggests that *sectarianism* as such might influence *achievement orientation*, but only in the lower *SES* group. Let us turn now to alienation, a condition produced by situations which we have dealt with on a number of occasions and which are often treated as one of the modern reasons for the attraction of sectariansim.

15. *Alienation:* Table 18 shows that both aspects of alienation we treat here—*bewilderment and confusion* and *mistrust of government officials*—are associated more closely with *sectarian*, than *non-sectarian* churches. Literature cited earlier, as well as the theoretical framework we have used to propose our hypotheses, clearly indicates the above relationship exists today because certain segments of our population do not see order in society, and do not feel

Table 16
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION AND SECTARIAN AND NON-SECTARIAN AFFILIATION (N=891)

Affiliation	Achievement Motivation Scale High	Low		
Non-sectarian	57.0%	43.0%	100.0%	(671)
Sectarian	47.0	53.0	100.0	(220)
	$x^2 = 7.03$*			

*Sig. at the one pct. level

0016

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 17

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RANKING WAYS OF LIFE PREFERENCES IN TERMS OF ACHIEVEMENT AND SUCCESS AND SECTARIAN AND NON-SECTARIAN AFFILIATION HOLDING SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS CONSTANT (N=856)

	Achievement and Success Orientation				
Affiliation	High	Medium	Low	Total Percent	No. of Cases
Non-sectarian	28.0%	42.0%	30.0%	100.0%	(644)
Sectarian	13.0	42.0	45.0	100.0	(212)

$x^2 = 11.12^{**}$

	High S.E.S.			Low S.E.S.		
	Achievement and Success Orientation			Achievement and Success Orientation		
Affiliation	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low
Non-sectarian	30.0%	39.0%	31.0%	19.0%	40.0%	41.0%
Sectarian	22.0	37.0	41.0	11.0	42.0	47.0
	$x^2 = 1.78$			$x^2 = 4.87^{*}$		

*Sig. at the five pct. level
**Sig. at the one pct. level

Table 18

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ASPECTS OF ALIENATION AND SECTARIAN AND NON-SECTARIAN AFFILIATION, HOLDING SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS CONSTANT (N=861)

Affiliation	% with High Bewilderment and Confusion	% with High Mistrust in Government Officials
Non-sectarian	49.0%	40.0%
Sectarian	68.0	58.0
	$x^2 = 22.3^{*}$	$x^2 = 14.97^{*}$

	High S.E.S.		High S.E.S.	
Affiliation	% with High Bewilderment and Confusion	% with High Mistrust in Government Officials	% with High Bewilderment and Confusion	% with High Mistrust in Government Officials
Non-Sectarian	38.0	28.0	75.0	62.0
Sectarian	49.0	31.0	80.0	64.0
	$x^2 = 0.03$	$x^2 = 0.19$	$x^2 = 1.2$	$x^2 = 0.26$

*Sig. at the one pct. level

001

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

part of it, and therefore turn or retreat, into a sectarian church in an attempt to find meaning in their lives and alleviation of their anxieties.

However, the fact that the alienation of the members of the sectarian churches is due to the way our socio-economic structure is functioning can be seen in the lower part of Table 18 which shows that the relationship between *alienation* and the *sectarian, non-sectarian* dichotomy disappears when *SES* is controlled.

16. *Attitudes Toward Progress, Education and Welfare:* As is the case with most dimensions we have treated under this sub-heading, the relationship between the three, *attitudes towards progress, education and welfare,* and the *sectarian, non-sectarian* dichotomy is similar to that of *religiosity* and these three attitudes which we examined in the previous part of this paper. Higher *religiosity* respondents, in other words, tend, in a number of cases, to behave the way sectarian respondents do.[42]

As Table 19 shows, *sectarianism* is not related to *attitudes toward progress,* which is the opposite of what many policy makers consider to be true. But *sectarianism* is negatively related to *attitudes toward education* and positively to *attitudes toward welfare.* The corresponding relationships are similar in Table 13 where we examined *religiosity* in relation to these attitudes.

living are more characteristic of *sectarian* than *non-sectarian* respondents (differences significant at the one percent level), while *familism, education* and *recreation* tend to be more or less characteristic of respondents who are members of *non-sectarian* churches.

18. *Perception of Health:* Another factor which, on the basis of our theoretical framework, could possibly be a correlate of sectarianism is *perception of one's good physical health,* which as the upper part of Table 21 shows appears to be related negatively to *sectariansim.* In other words, members of sectarian churches do not perceive themselves as physically as healthy as non-sectarians do. But this relationship again disappears when *SES* is controlled (lower part of Table 21). Therefore, the fact that members of sectarian churches do not perceive themselves as healthy as members of non-sectarian churches, is not due to their religion, but simply to the lower *SES* standing which is a characteristic often associated with membership in sectarian churches.

C. Religiosity in Relationship to Community Size and Migration

Data presented here have been taken from studies in which the same sample and questionnaire were used, but were published in separate publications.

Table 19
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELECTED ATTITUDES AND SECTARIAN AND NON-SECTARIAN AFFILIATION (N=862)

Affiliation	% with more Favorable Attitude Toward Progress	% with more Favorable Attitude Toward Education	% with more Favorable Attitude Toward Welfare
Non-Sectarian	48.0%	48.0%	47.0%
Sectarian	48.0	40.0	65.0
	$x^2 = 0.04$	$x^2 = 4.59$*	$x^2 = 21.77$**

*Sig. at the five pct. level
**Sig. at the one pct. level

When *SES*—the variable which on the basis of our theoretical framework, appears to be a crucial possible intervening variable for most of the dimensions we are treating in this paper—is controlled, both the relationship of *sectarianism* and *attitudes toward welfare* and the negative relationship with *education* disappear completely.

In other words, the favorable attitudes of sectarians toward *welfare* and the less favorable (than non-sectarian) attitudes toward *education* are not due to the influence of the sectarian nature of religion of these people, but to the influence of their lower *SES.*[43]

17. *Preferences as to Ways of Life:* In relation to more than half of the *preferences as to ways of life* we treated in this study, there are significant differences between members of *sectarian* and *non-sectarian* churches. (Table 20) *Preference of a life in line with religion* and *outdoor*

19. *Community Size:* Another characteristic which, at least in Appalachia, is closely related to religiosity is size of community. Excluding suburban communities, community size is usually associated with homogeneity and isolation, both important determinants of the nature of the social organization and the culture when small communities are compared with larger ones.

Small size, homogeneity and isolation are attributes which favor the building of a community social system characterized by high cohesiveness and integration; such integration in turn favors preservation of old institutional forms, including those associated with religion and resistance to change. In other words, there was, and to an extent still is, a tendency in the small community to retain the religion of the early settlers.

0018

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 20
PREFERENCES AS TO WAYS OF LIFE OF RESPONDENTS WITH SECTARIAN AND NON-SECTARIAN AFFILIATIONS (N=858)*

	Proportion of Respondents Valuing More a Life in Line with:								
Affiliation	Family	Religion	Work	Friend-ship	Achieve-ment	Education	Recre-ation	Outdoor Living	Material Conveni-ences
Non-Sectarian	55.0%	39.0%	56.0%	45.0%	56.0%	48.0%	61.0%	53.0%	56.0%
Sectarian	47.0	56.0	49.0	35.0	56.0	36.0	50.0	67.0	51.0
	$x^2 =$ 3.8*	$x^2 =$ 19.8**	$x^2 =$ 2.64	$x^2 =$ .03	$x^2 =$ 0	$x^2 =$ 9.3**	$x^2 =$ 7.9**	$x^2 =$ 12.8*	$x^2 =$ 1.3

*Percentages do not show which value is more important as compared to other values; they show only differences between respondents with sectarian and non-sectarian affiliations in reference to each individual value.
**Sig. at the five pct. level
***Sig. at the one pct. level

Table 21
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEPTION OF ONE'S HEALTH AND SECTARIAN AND NON-SECTARIAN AFFILIATION, HOLDING SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS CONSTANT (N=910)

	Perception of Good Health				
Affiliation	High	Medium	Low	Total Percent	No. of Cases
Non-sectarian	36.0%	37.0%	26.0%	100.0%	(686)
Sectarian	24.0	31.0	46.0	100.0	(224)
			$x^2 = 30.60$*		

	Perception of Good Health					
	High S.E.S.			Low S.E.S.		
Affiliation	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low
Non-sectarian	47.0%	35.0%	18.0%	22.0%	34.0%	44.0%
Sectarian	41.0	43.0	16.0	20.0	30.0	50.0
	$x^2 = .842$			$x^2 = 1.751$		

*Sig. at the one pct. level

What has kept religion traditional has also kept traditional the rest of the social organization of the small community; therefore, when the new mass of influences of communication and transportation began impacting on the isolation factor, the semi-autonomy of the small community started disappearing and it began to respond more and more to the pressures and higher expectations of the larger society. Lack of means, however, to fulfill such expectations led to out-migration—which is examined later under this same heading—and those left behind developed increasingly stronger feelings of alienation and frustrations.[44]

To summarize the above discussion, we could say that some of the major factors which might either explain—or allow us to hypothesize—the differences in religiosity in the small community as compared to the larger ones are: (1) the cohesiveness of the old small community which in some ways helped the preservation of old religious forms; (2) present social disorganization and, in turn, anxieties and need for religion which prevails in the rural community today simply because of the cohesiveness and isolation of the past; (3) in terms of socio-economic characteristics, different kinds of people reside in the small community, and therefore have needs for religion that differ from the needs of residents of larger communities.

0019

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 22
RURAL-URBAN DIFFERENCES AND RELIGIOSITY

	URBAN AREAS		RURAL AREAS		
of Response	Charleston N=146	Morgantown N=150	Sml. Twn. Min.-Hard. Co. N=130	Open Ctry. Min.-Hard. Co. N=236	Open Ctry. Raleigh Co. N=246
			Question: I believe there is life after death		
Percent Agreeing	88.3%	83.6%	88.5%	87.7%	99.6%
			Question: I believe the world is soon coming to an end		
Percent Agreeing	13.3	19.9	33.1	42.3	62.7
			Question: I believe there is a God who hears and answers prayers		
Percent Agreeing	95.9	88.5	98.5	96.2	99.2
			Orthodox Belief Scale		
Percent with High Scores	58.7	58.7	79.1	77.1	91.4
			Question: Religion keeps me going		
Percent Agreeing	48.3	52.2	66.9	69.8	73.8
			Question: My faith in God is the best means of forgetting my daily worries		
Percent Agreeing	61.6	62.2	80.0	86.8	88.4
			Question: Churches should make provisions to help people testify they are saved		
Percent Agreeing	18.9	28.2	46.9	55.9	65.7
			Religion as a buffer to the outside world scale		
Percent with High Scores	27.7	40.0	58.5	58.2	66.2
			Rank order of the first three among nine different "preferences as to ways of life"		
First Choice	Family	Family	Religion	Religion	Religion
Second Choice	Religion	Religion	Family	Family	Family
Third Choice	Work	Work	Education	Education	Education
			Question: How often do you attend church?		
Frequently	51.4	53.3	56.9	47.2	40.9
Occasionally	39.4	30.7	33.8	38.7	32.3
Not at all	9.2	16.0	9.3	14.1	26.8

0020

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 22 includes information taken from another publication[45] that shows some of the dramatic differences which exist between rural and urban areas in terms of religiosity. The table has data from two larger urban communities, Charleston, about 85,000 population, and Morgantown, about 25,000, and also three rural ones, which have less than 2,500 inhabitants each–the official demarcation line between what is considered rural and urban. The smaller communities are located in Mineral and Hardy Counties in the northern and less typically Appalachian part of the state.

The fourth line of Table 22 shows the proportion of strong believers which corresponds to communities of different sizes, when belief is measured as defined under Methodology. This table shows that people in smaller communities are stronger believers than those in larger ones, and in particular those from Raleigh County which is more typically Appalachian. The differences among the two larger communities in Mineral and Hardy Counties and those of Raleigh County, are significant at the one percent level.

In regard to the individual questions used in the *belief* scale (first three lines of the table), differences are pronounced only when the question–*the world is soon coming to an end,* is concerned; in that the negative relationship between *size* and *belief* exists either in terms of a dichotomy between the two larger and the other three small communities, or in terms of a continuum involving all five types of communities individually. Differences in relation to the other questions measuring regular orthodox belief questions (lines one and three of Table 22) are almost non-existent.

Significant differences among the five communities both in terms of a continuum or a dichotomy also exist in relation to the variable *need to use religion as a buffer to the outside world* (8th line of Table 22). The same is true about the three individual questions which are among the seven used to define this dimension. But here again, the more pronounced differences exist in relation to the question which indicated sectarianism. . .*churches should make provisions to help people testify they are saved.*

When comparing individual questions between two scales, *belief* and *need to use religion as a buffer,* and excluding from each scale the question which refers to sectarianism, one could say that the differences in size exist primarily in relation to questions which imply need to use religion as a buffer, and of course, the two questions which imply sectarianism. In other words, community size is negatively related, primarily to emotional types of religion, and religion which can be used as a mechanism to alleviate anxieties. In line with the theoretical framework we have been advancing, close correlates of this type of religiosity, such as *alienation, lower level of living* and *less education,* are also related to size in a similar way.

The ninth line of Table 22 shows the rank order of the first three choices of *preferences as to ways of life* indicating the dichtomy between the two largest and the rest of the communities. *Life in line with religion* is the first choice for the three smaller communities and the second choice for the two largest ones.

Finally, the direction of the relationship between *religiosity* and *size* becomes reversed when it comes to frequency of *church participation.* The small towns of Mineral and Hardy County (primarily towns of 500 to 2500 inhabitants) have the highest proportion of frequent attendants (56.9 percent) and Open Country Raleigh County communities, which otherwise are more religious, the lowest (40.9 percent).

In terms of *participation,* the two largest communities are not statistically different from small towns of Mineral and Hardy Counties, but are statistically different from Open Country communities of Raleigh County. Communities such as the latter include a certain proportion of believers who are not church participants and sometimes not even members, and also include proportions of returned migrants; some of these people drop their institutionalized churches to join sectarian ones. Let us now turn to migration and examine the way it is related to religiosity.

20. *Migration:* Recent literature on migration from Appalachia examines the process of migration as a consequence of technological changes which led to more employment in the city, the loss of isolation of the small community and in turn, the socio-psychological incorporation of the rural into the urban.[46] This incorporation produced a shift in reference groups, from the small community to the city, and in turn carried the development of higher expectations and stronger feelings of relative deprivation. Because rural Appalachia in particular did not provide means for people to fulfill the new expectations, out-migration, often without sufficient preparation or potential for adjustment in the city, became the answer.

Another answer which became apparent for some of those who, for one reason or another, could not migrate was retreat from a community or a society which became less meaningful. This retreat sometimes involved closer attachment to selected old ways of life, welfare roles, sectarian religions or even social isolation. Similar types of tendencies for retreat also appeared among migrants who for one reason or another did not make the score in the city and came back to their community.

Those Appalachians who migrated to the city, at least during the first years of migration, settled in a close-to-downtown low income area, which later, in some cities such as Cleveland, became known as the Appalachian ghetto. In later years, those who adjusted to city life better, moved to the suburbs. But newcomers, who were usually younger, and some of the old who, for one reason or another, felt more comfortable in the ghetto, remained there.

Table 23 deals with *religiosity* in relation to *migration,* particularly with four groups of people: those who live in the suburbs of Cleveland, in the ghetto of Cleveland, those who returned to West Virginia and those who never migrated. Close to four hundred male adult migrants from West Virginia were interviewed in the suburbs and about

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 23
RELIGIOSITY AMONG NON-MIGRANTS, RETURNED MIGRANTS IN WEST VIRGINIA AND GHETTO AND SUBURBS OF CLEVELAND FOR TOTAL GROUPS AND GROUPS MATCHED IN TERMS OF AGE AND EDUCATION

Degree of Agreement	Non-Migrant	Returned Migrant	Ghetto	Suburb	Non-Migrant	Returned Migrant	Ghetto	Suburb
			Question: I believe there is a life after death					
St., Mod. Agreeing	83.2%	86.0%	77.7%	79.1%	83.8%	88.0%	81.1%	78.8%
			Question: I believe that the world is soon coming to an end					
St., Mod. Agreeing	29.0	32.9	48.0	27.0	32.6	30.5	49.3	24.5
			Question: I believe there is a God who hears and answers prayers					
St., Mod. Agreeing	91.0	93.3	93.3	87.3	91.9	93.3	94.7	86.7
			Orthodox Belief Scale					
Percentage Highest Score	36.4	41.6	59.6	32.9	43.4	43.0	58.9	28.3
			Sectarian, Non-sectarian Affiliation					
Sec.	22.7	32.4	22.1	19.0	31.0	41.4	15.4	25.6
Non-sec.	77.3	67.6	77.9	81.0	69.0	58.6	84.6	74.4
			Frequency of Church Attendance					
Frequently	54.8	39.7	13.2	35.2	36.0	35.7	17.6	34.1
Occa.	40.4	38.8	19.2	44.6	47.2	44.3	21.6	46.8
Not at all	4.8	21.5	67.6	20.2	16.8	20.0	60.8	19.1
			Rank Order of the First Three Among Nine Different "Preferences as to Ways of Life"					
1st Choice	Religion	Religion	Family	Family	Religion	Religion	Religion	Family
2nd Choice	Family	Family	Religion	Religion	Family	Family	Family	Mat. Conven.
3rd Choice	Education	Education	Education	Work	Education	Education	Education	Friendship
			Need to Use Religion as a Buffer to the Outside World Scale					
Percent with High Scores	*	*	40.2	50.0	*	*	43.8	39.8

*Data not available

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

two-hundred in the so-called Appalachian ghetto. The questions which were used for the *religiosity* dimensions were in most respects similar to those used in the state of West Virginia.

Because the comparison of our groups involves groups with different basic characteristics–for instance, ghetto residents tend to be younger than the other three groups–*age* and *education* were used as control variables for all comparisons presented in Table 23. In line with the proposition we are advancing in this paper, we expect that groups which are under more stress, such as returned migrants or ghetto residents, will score higher on *religiosity*. Furthermore, such differences among these groups would remain if *age* and *education*, which are probably intervening variables, were controlled.

The four left columns of Table 23, in which the four groups are compared before they are matched, shows that in terms of religious beliefs (fourth line of the table) returned migrants and ghetto residents have the highest proportion of strong believers. But when the four groups were controlled in terms of *age* and *education* (four right columns) some changes appeared: the differences in the two West Virginia groups disappeared, while those of the Cleveland groups increased. Among the four groups, ghetto residents had the highest proportion of strong believers and the suburbs the lowest, while those in West Virginia were in the middle.

As was the case in other similar situations, when individual questions were examined, the scale differences appeared primarily in the responses to the question which implies sectarianism. . .*the world is soon coming to an end.* As the fifth line of Table 23 indicates, the latter is true in spite of the fact that the ghetto group, when matched, has the lowest proportion (15.4 percent) of respondents who are members of sectarian churches. This in turn, suggests the need for sectarian type of religion when one is under stress even if he is not a member of a sectarian church. But, as one of the major themes which is developing through these data suggests, people who are under stress feel the need for this kind of religion, and when the opporutnity arrives, some practice it. At least at the time the survey was conducted, there were not enough organized churches of this kind in the Cleveland ghetto, though they existed, of course, in the hollows of the state, and returned migrants, as the fifth line of Table 23 indicates, took advantage of them.

The situation continues to remain consistent with data presented in the previous pages of this paper when it comes to church participation; ghetto residents, the strongest believers, are the least frequent church participants.[47]

Finally, as the seventh line of Table 23 shows, concerning preferences as to ways of life when *age* and *education* are controlled, religion ranks first for all groups except suburbanites. As data presented elsewhere indicate, the latter, at least in terms of standard expectations of the American society, are the most successful and well-adjusted groups. Measured with a different form of analysis, the same preferences for family life as compared to religion is shown by the suburbanities.[48] Despite this, however, when it comes to use of religion as a buffer, the differences between the two groups tend to disappear when *age* and *education* are controlled, although ghetto ranks a little higher than suburbs (43.8 percent versus 39.8 percent).[49]

APPENDIX

Table 1

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AND ASPECTS OF RELIGIOSITY (N=1032-1064)

Employment	% Strong Believers	% with Strong Need to use Relig. as a Buffer	% with Strong Preference for Religious Life	% with High Church Participation
Full Time	32.0%	35.0%	53.0%	51.0%
Part Time or Unemployed	49.0	60.0	61.0	40.0
	$x^2 = 25.7$**	$x^2 = 56.2$**	$x^2 = 6.8$**	$x^2 = 10.9$**

*Sig. at the five pct. level
**Sig. at the one pct. level

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX
Table 2
ASPECTS OF RELIGIOSITY AMONG VARIOUS DENOMINATIONS

Denomination	% Strong Believers	% with Strong Need to use Relig. as a Buffer	% with Strong Preference for Religious Life	% with High Church Participation
Methodist	27.0%	38.0%	47.0%	53.0%
Presbyterian	22.0	32.0	58.0	54.0
Catholic	21.0	19.0	49.0	73.0
Episcopal	17.0	17.0	29.0	44.0
Baptist	52.0	51.0	67.0	52.0
Lutheran	24.0	24.0	54.0	61.0
Evangelical United Brethren	46.0	68.0	69.0	58.0
Pentacostal & Seventh Day Adventist	56.0	79.0	56.0	56.0
Other*	51.0	45.0	55.0	27.0

*Includes both fundamentalist and non-fundamentalist churches.

APPENDIX
Table 3
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELECTED PREFERENCES AS TO WAYS OF LIFE AND ASPECTS OF RELIGIOSITY

Preference of a Style of Life in Line with:	Inten-sity	% Strong Believers	% with Strong Need to use Relig. as a Buffer	% with Strong Preference for Religious Life	% with High Church Participation
Family	High	50.0%	49.0%	52.0%	53.0%
	Low	50.0	51.0	48.0	47.0
Religion	High	63.0**	56.0**	–	57.0**
	Low	37.0	44.0	–	43.0
Education	High	38.0**	41.0**	44.0*	44.0*
	Low	62.0	59.0	56.0	56.0
Friendship	High	33.0**	55.0	53.0	50.0
	Low	41.0	55.0	58.0	47.0
Material Conveniences	High	31.0**	49.0**	44.0**	42.0**
	Low	43.0	63.0	67.0	55.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Achievement	High	33.0*	54.0	50.0**	52.0
	Low	40.0	56.0	62.0	48.0
Outdoor Living	High	43.0**	62.0**	52.0	44.0**
	Low	26.0	52.0	57.0	54.0
Recreation	High	30.0**	48.0**	40.0**	48.0
	Low	45.0	68.0	66.0	50.0

*Sig. at the five pct. level
**Sig. at the one pct. level

APPENDIX
Table 4
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TYPE OF OCCUPATION AND SECTARIAN–NON-SECTARIAN AFFILIATION

Type of Occupation	Non-sectarian	Sectarian	Neither	Total Percent	Total Cases
Unskilled and Semi-skilled	49.0%	24.0%	27.0%	100.0%	(366)
Skilled	63.0	17.0	20.0	100.0	(96)
Farmer	54.0	43.0	3.0	100.0	(72)
White collar, Managerial and Businessman	84.0	8.0	8.0	100.0	(173)
Professional	87.0	7.0	6.0	100.0	(72)

IV CONCLUSIONS

From a historical perspective, it has been the experience of organized Christianity that "man's extremity is God's opportunity." These data tend to confirm that observation. The hypothesis that the dispossessed, deprived, and alienated resulting from the unpheaval of social and technological change in Appalachia would be those exhibiting the greatest need for the support of religion, is substantiated by the data. The aged, poor, less educated, alienated and infirm, all rank significantly higher in *religiosity* than do the socially well-adjusted. This is consistently so in all aspects of *religiosity* except *church participation,* where the relationship tends to be reversed. But, even among the other three aspects of *religiosity* there are differences, because relationships are considerably stronger for *belief* and *need to use religion as a buffer* than for *preference of a life in line with religion.*

In the context of the theoretical framework, this suggests the expressive emotional type of religion seems to be associated more with attributes of individuals and groups who have experienced greater dislocation by modern complexity and change. On the other hand, *church participation,* the least emotional aspect of *religiosity,* appears to be associated more with attributes of individuals and groups who have experienced less dislocation. The latter would seem to imply the use of religion as a status maintenance and stabilization vehicle by those who do well in society.

Institutionalized religion as represented by the established churches reflects the society of which it is a part. One of its major functions is a conservative one–to uphold the values and norms of society and help to maintain a stable social structure. For those individuals whose needs are met by the social order, religion's role is a supportive one and higher participation in church therefore, tends to be more positively correlated with the socially well-adjusted.

For the socially maladjusted–the deprived, alienated and dispossessed, whose needs are not met by the established social institutions, it is another story. Institutionalized religion, like the social structure of which it is a part, tends to become a part of the disenfranchisement.

However, man's needs for purpose and meaning in life are not to be denied. The data indicate that sectariansim provides the pattern of beliefs that more closely meet the personal needs of the socially dislocated. That sectarianism is a response to the personal needs of its adherents, is indicated in the comparison of members of sectarian groups with those of established churches when socio-economic

0025

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

status is controlled. No significant differences are found between the two groups in their orientation toward achievement, degree of alienation, attitudes toward progress, education and welfare, and perception of health. The differences where they exist, are primarily a function of their lower socio-economic status—not of their religious faith.

The implications of these findings in the light of the church's historic ministry of healing and reconciliation appear to be twofold: (1) the role of institutionalized religion to help restore the dispossessed to fuller participation in society, and (2) the role of religion in stabilizing societal change to minimize dislocation and deprivation.

Within the Church, as society continues at the present rate of rapid technological change and increases in complexity and confusion with attendant dislocations in the lives of people, it appears the current trend toward conservatism and fundamentalism will continue.[50] Similarly, as opportunities for socio-economic advancement develop, the Church will continue to play a role in meeting the spiritual needs of those who want to advance or stabilize their place in society.

The basis question appears to be: Can the Institutional Church develop programs which are capable of meeting the multiple religious needs of people who want, (a) something in life to hold on to and give it meaning, (b) to enhance and stabilize their social position and (c) to live a spiritual life in accord with their value orientation—under the same roof,—in the same Denomination? Or should the existing pattern of diversification be accepted, understood, and legitimized as the total ministry to the religious needs of man?

Among the dispossessed, the evidence indicates the Church can perform a sorely needed ministry by providing socio-psychological mooring to the anxiety-ridden through the development of religious faith.

0026

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOOTNOTES

1. See "The passing of Provincialism," by Thomas Ford in *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*, Edited by Thomas Ford, University of Kentucky Press, 1962. For additional information on Appalachian religion see also: Earl D.C. Brewer, "Religion and the Churches," Chapter 13 in *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*; Jack E. Weller, "The Mountaineer and the Church," Chapter 7 in *Yesterday's People*, University of Kentucky Press, 1965; Berton H. Kaplan, "Religion–Traditional and Modern," Chapter 10 in *Blue Ridge*, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1971; Thomas E. Woodall and B.B. Maurer, "Cooperative Creativity by Community, University and Church," Chapter 8 in *Appalachia in Transition*, Edited by Max E. Glenn, Bethany Press, 1970; Ernest J. Nesius, "The Role of the Church in Appalachia," *Proceedings–CORA 1966*, Commission on Religion in Appalachia, Knoxville, Tenn., 1966; O. Norman Simpkins, "Culture," No 7, in *Mountain Heritage Series*, and B.B. Maurer, "Religion," No. 4 in *Mountain Heritage Series*, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, 1972.

2. Robert Coles, "God and the Rural Poor," Psychology Today," January 1972, pp. 33-40.

3. This larger study was in a large part supported by the Department of Labor.

4. Emile Durkheim, "The Elementary Forms of Religious Life," Trans. by Joseph Ward Swain, The Free Press, 1954, p. 323.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 416.

6. For a summary type or presentation of information dealing with the relationships between religion and society, see "The Sociology of Religion," by Thomas F. O'Dea in Foundations of Modern Sociology Series, Prentice-Hall, 1965.

7. U.S. Census of Religious Bodies, 1926.

8. Bernard Quinn and Douglas Johnson, eds., *Atlas of the Church in Appalachia*, Commission on Religion in Appalachia, Knoxville, Tenn., 1971.

9. W.D. Weatherford and Earl D.C. Brewer, *Life and Religion in Southern Appalachia*, New York, Friendship Press, 1962, p. 161.

10. Jerome Pickard, "Population in Appalachia and the United States: Year 2000," *Appalachia*, Vol. V., No. 7, July-August, 1972.

11. Jack E. Weller, "How Religion Mirrors and Meets Appalachian Culture," Chapter 10 in *Appalachia in Transition*, ed. Max E. Glenn, The Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1970.

12. The nine preferences as to ways of life refer to the areas of religion, family, education, work, material conveniences, achievement, friendship, recreation, and outdoor living. For more information see "West Virginians in their Own State and Cleveland, Ohio," Selected Social and Psychological Characteristics, Appalachian Center, Research Report No. 3, West Virginia University, Morgantown, 1970, pp. 125-142.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 47-48.

14. In the case of Charleston, nineteen segments representing eight different socio-economic strats were selected. In some of these segments the nth block and in each block the nth household were selected for interview. Thus, besides open country and very small towns, the following towns were included in the sample: Piedmont and Keyser, Mineral County (population 2,000 and 6,192, respectively); Beckley, Raleigh County (population 18,642); Morgantown, Monongalia County (population 22,587); and Charleston, Kanawha County (population 85,796).

15. Coefficient of contingency although not a rigorous test of association is suitable for four cell tables.

16. See Robert Merton, "Social Theory and Social Structure," The Free Press, 1956, pp. 170-176.

17. Belief can be classified as intrinsic or extrinsic; the former usually includes people who become believers because they need something to hold on to. The latter are usually people whose values are in line with the Christian doctrine. See John Photiadis and Jeanne Biggar, "Religiosity, Education and Ethnic Distance," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 67, No. 6, May 1962. For additional testing of the involved variables see John Photiadis and Arthur Johnson, "Orthodoxy Church Participation and Authoritarianism," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 67, No. 3, Nov. 1963.

18. For more information on this scale see "West Virginians in Their Own State and Cleveland, Ohio," *op. cit.*, pp. 69-76.

19. For an understanding of the way church participation behaves as a variable in an Appalachian state–which is in most cases different than the behavior of the variable elsewhere–we cite a statement by W.D. Weatherford and Earl D.C. Brewer, "Fewer people in the mountains belong to churches than in any comparable territory east of the Mississippi River. Someone has said that the Appalachian people are more religious and less church-related than any other group in the country. This may or may not be true, but it is true that formal church membership is below the national average. It is uncertain that revivalism of the old frontier type fits present-day conditions. Yet programs of reaching and teaching people in the meaning of Christian faith and life would seem urgent, if the region is to continue its movement toward national norms in religious membership." For more information see W.D. Weatherford and Earl D.C. Brewer, "Life and Religion in Southern Appalachia," Friendship Press, 1962, pp. 161.

20. See John Photiadis, "Overt Conformity to Church Teaching as a Function of Religious Beliefs and Group Participation," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 70, No. 4, 1965. Also see "Religion and the Churches," by Earl D.C. Brewer in *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*, Edited by Thomas Ford, University of Kentucky Press, 1962, p. 207.

21. For some interesting research data on the role of mass media (radio and television) in the religious life of Appalachians see Foster Mullenax, "Poor Man's Gallup Poll," in *Selected Proceedings of a Critical Issues Seminar*, May 1969, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia. For information on the influence of the folk tradition in maintaining the religious life of Appalachians see Patrick W. Gainer, "Traditional Music in the Home of the West Virginia Mountaineer," No. 8 in the *Mountain Heritage Series*, Nov. 1972. Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia.

22. Refers to the respondent's annual income.

23. For a description of the level of living scale see "West Virginians in Their Own State and in Cleveland, Ohio," *op. cit.*, pp. 76-88.

24. As it has been the case with other relationships where church participation is involved, the positive relationship might be due to the positive relationship between participation and *SES*.

25. Additional values involved in this scale were: life in line with: friendship, outdoor living, family, recreation and material comfort.

26. For a recent treatment of alienation see "Alienation Concept Character and Meaning," by Frank Johnson, Seminar Press, 1973. For a bibliography on alienation see "Social Aspects of Alienation–An Annotated Bibliography," printed by National Institute of Mental Health, 1973.

27. For a description of the scale see "West Virginians in Their Own State and in Cleveland, Ohio," *op. cit.*, pp. 217-219.

28. *Ibid.*, pp. 214-215.

29. See Anne R. Dauenheimer, "Some Correlates of Alienation Among Southern Appalachians," M.S. Thesis, 1966.

30. Robert Coles, "God and the Rural Poor," *Psychology Today*, January 1972. Also see Nathan L. Gerrard, "Churches of the Stationary Poor in Southern Appalachia," Edited by John Photiadis and Harry Schwarzweller, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970, and Thomas Ford, "The Passing of Provincialism" in *The Southern Appalachian Region: A Survey*," op. cit.

0027

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

31. The Evangelical United Brethren Church merged with The Methodist Church April 23, 1968 to form The United Methodist Church.

32. For a relevant discussion see John Photiadis, "Rural Southern Appalachia and Mass Society," in *Change in Rural Appalachia*, John Photiadis and Harry Schwarzweller, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.

33. For more information on this scale see "West Virginians in Their Own State and in Cleveland, Ohio," *op. cit.*, pp. 171-200.

34. *Ibid.*, pp. 54, 115.

35. The negative relationship between religiosity and attitudes toward education becomes positive primarily under high SES and remains negative, but not significant, under low SES. On the other hand, the positive relationship between religiosity and attitudes toward welfare is retained in some situations and disappears in others, but does not become reversed.

36. However, the relationship between church participation and outdoor living is negative.

37. Russell R. Dynes, "Church-Sect Typology and Socio-economic Status," *American Sociological Review*, Oct. 1955, pp. 555-560.

38. Milton Yinger, "Religion, Society and the Individual," The MacMillian Co., 1957, pp. 142-155.

39. For a relevant discussion see "Changes in Rural Appalachia," *op. cit.*, Chapter 15 on future aims of action programs.

40. The x^2 under the high and low of the control variable *SES* are 5.49 and 5.28 (both significant at the five percent level) and the coefficient of contingency from C=.233 becomes correspondingly C=.199 and C=.095.

41. The two x^2 under the high and low of the control variable are x^2=1.2 and x^2=2.54 both not significant at the five percent level, while the coefficient of contingency which is C=.087 in the initial table becomes C=;056 and C=.066 under the high and low of the control variable.

42. As a matter of fact, the more religious non-sectarian respondents are, the more they tend to behave, at least in terms of dimensions we are examining, as sectarian. This, when carefully contemplated, offers further evidence of the importance for modern society of the anxiety relieving functions of religion.

43. The relationships to attitudes with progress was not significant even in the initial table (Table 19).

44. See John Photiadis, "Community Size and Social Attributes in West Virginia," Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, Research Report 5.

45. *Ibid.*

46. See *Change in Rural Appalachia*, Chapter 1, *op. cit.*

47. Frequency of participation here refers to service attendance only.

48. See "West Virginians in Their Own State and In Cleveland, Ohio: Summary and Conclusions of a Comparative Social Study," John Photiadis, Appalachian Center, West Virginia University, Information Report No. 3.

49. Before age and education are controlled, the suburbs are shown to have higher proportions of respondents who need religion to alleviate anxieties produced by modern complexity, probably because suburbanities tend to be older than ghetto residents.

50. For additional information see: Reginald W. Bibby and Merlin B. Brinkerhoff, "The Circulation of the Saints: A Study of People who Join Conservative Churches," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, Vol. 12, No. 3, September 1973, and Dean M. Kelley, *Why Conservative Churches are Growing*, New York, Harper and Row, 1972.

1028

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Programs and activities offered by the West Virginia University Cooperative Extension Service are available to all persons without regard to race, color, sex, religion or national origin.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY
Series 74, No. 8-4 February 1974

Issued Monday, Wednesday, Friday
Second Class postage paid at
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

0629